



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692,435	10/23/2003	Brandon Vaughn Taylor	MSFT-2571/302767.1	8406

41505	7590	11/29/2007
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)		
CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR		
2929 ARCH STREET		
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891		


EXAMINER	
LAI, MICHAEL C	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2157	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/29/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/692,435	Applicant(s) TAYLOR ET AL. 	
	Examiner Michael C. Lai	Art Unit 2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>23 oct 2003</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is responsive to amendment filed on 9/7/2007.

Response to Amendment

The examiner has acknowledged the amended claims 1-7, 11-13, 15, 18-21, 23 and 25.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-2, 18-19 and 26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-2, 18-19, 22, 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti et al. ("The structuring of a wireless internet application for a music-on-demand service on UMTS devices", March 2002, ACM Press, hereinafter referred to as Roccetti), in view of Anderson et al. (US 2002/0194307 A1, hereinafter referred to as Anderson).

Regarding claim 1, Roccetti discloses a method for distributing content over a communications network, comprising:

logging on to a server by a web-enabled device (the gateway system accepts and manages all the requests for songs arriving from the client connected to a given UMTS terminal, page 1068, column 2, paragraph 1);

generating a list of accessible content available at the server ("top-10 service", page 1069, column 1, paragraph 1);

providing the list to the web-enabled device ("top-10 service", page 1069, column 1, paragraph 1);

selecting a particular accessible content from the list of accessible content at the web-enabled device ("top-10 service", page 1069, column 1, paragraph 1);

transmitting the selection to the server (download session, page 1068, column 2, paragraph 2);

retrieving the selected content from a storage associated with the server (download session, page 1068, column 2, paragraph 2); and

electronically transmitting from the server the selected accessible content to the one or more designated devices (download session, page 1068, column 2, paragraph 2).

Rocchetti substantially discloses the invention as claimed. However, Rocchetti is silent about **sending information to the server by the web-enabled device as to one or more designated devices not including the web-enabled device which are selected by the web-enabled device to receive the selected content.**

However, Anderson teaches remotely sending a document to a printer or a destination address on the network by a user of a mobile device via a request email message (see Anderson Abstract and paragraph 0040). Thus, it is respectfully submitted that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Anderson into the method of Roccetti at the time of the invention to send information to the server by the web-enabled device as to one or more designated devices not including the web-enabled device which are selected by the web-enabled device to receive the selected content. The motivation would be providing an efficient method for remotely managing and/or accessing content stored on a network device via another network device.

Regarding claim 2, Roccetti and Anderson disclose the method according to claim 1, further comprising receiving a request for content distribution from the web-enabled device, prior to generating the list (Roccetti, download session, page 1068, column 2, paragraph 2).

Regarding claim 18, Roccetti discloses a system for distributing content to a designated device, comprising:

- a web-enabled device that can receive and provide a listing of content (page 1068, Fig. 1 and column 1, paragraph 1);

- a server with an associated storage device, the storage device maintaining content that had been previously provided by a first party associated with the web-enabled device to the storage, the server generating the listing of content to the web-enabled device, providing the

listing to the web-enabled device, receiving a selection of content from the web-enabled device, retrieving the selected content, and electronically transmitting the selected content to the designated device selected by the web-enabled device (page 1068, Fig. 1 and column 1, paragraph 1); and a communications network between the device and the server (page 1068, Fig. 1 and column 1, paragraph 1).

Rocchetti substantially discloses the invention as claimed. However, Rocchetti is silent about the web-enabled device that is different from the designated device.

However, Anderson teaches remotely sending a document to a printer or a destination address on the network by a user of a mobile device via a request email message (see Anderson Abstract and paragraph 0040). Note that the printer or the destination address is different from the mobile device (web-enabled device). Thus, it is respectfully submitted that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Anderson into the system of Rocchetti at the time of the invention to have the capability of having the web-enabled device being different from the designated device.. The motivation would be providing an efficient method for remotely managing and/or accessing content stored on a network device via another network device.

Regarding claim 19, Rocchetti and Anderson disclose the system according to claim 18, wherein the web-enabled device sends a request for content distribution to the server to activate the server generating the listing of content. (Rocchetti, download session, page 1068, column 2, paragraph 2).

Regarding claim 22, Roccetti and Anderson disclose the system according to claim 18, wherein the server transmits the content to a phone number, fax number, or address associated with the designated device (Roccetti, address, page 1068, Fig. 1 and column 1, paragraph 1. Note that Langseth also discloses a method that allows the subscriber to specify the output to be delivered to at least one of an electronic mailbox, facsimile, mobile phone, telephone, PDA, WAP device, and pager (col. 23, lines 1-10)).

Regarding claim 26, Roccetti and Anderson disclose the system according to claim 18, wherein the communications network is the internet (Roccetti, page 1068, Fig. 1).

Regarding claim 27, Roccetti and Anderson disclose the system according to claim 18, wherein the communications network is a LAN or WAN (Anderson, paragraph 0019).

Regarding claim 28, Roccetti and Anderson disclose the system according to claim 18, wherein the content comprises at least one of documents (Anderson paragraph 0040), pictures (Anderson paragraph 0042, images), and data.

3. Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti and Anderson, and further in view of K. Chen et al. (US 2004/0044731 A1, hereinafter referred to as K. Chen).

Regarding claim 3, Roccetti and Anderson disclose the method according to claim 1, but are silent about authenticating the web-enabled device, prior to generating the list. However, K. Chen discloses a method of authenticating the web-enabled device, prior to generating the list (page 12, paragraph 0091). Roccetti does mention

that security issues have not been addressed and will be their future research topic (page 1073, paragraph 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the authentication method taught by K. Chen into the method of Rocchetti and Anderson in order to prevent unauthorized access to content or document in a web system, thereby, providing a secured remote document retrieval.

Regarding claim 4, Rocchetti, Anderson and K. Chen disclose the method according to claim 3, further comprising receiving login information at the web-enabled device, and transmitting the login information to the server, wherein authenticating the web-enabled device comprises authenticating the login information (K. Chen, page 12, paragraphs 0092 and 0093). See motivation above.

4. Claims 5-8 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rocchetti and Anderson, and further in view of Langseth et al. (US 6,671,715 B1), hereinafter referred to as Langseth.

Regarding claim 5, Rocchetti and Anderson disclose the method according to claim 1, but are silent about receiving a phone number, fax number, or address for the one or more designated device at the server from the web-enabled device, prior to electronically transmitting the selected accessible content. However, Langseth discloses a method that allows the subscriber to specify the output to be delivered to at least one of an electronic mailbox, facsimile, mobile phone, telephone, PDA, WAP device, and pager (claim 13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Langseth into the method of Rocchetti and Anderson at

the time of the invention to receive a phone number, fax number, or address for the one or more designated device, prior to electronically transmitting the selected accessible content. The motivation to incorporate the teaching of Langseth into Roccetti's and Anderson's method would be to enable transmitting the content to specified destination/device.

Regarding claim 6, Roccetti, Anderson and Langseth disclose the method according to claim 5, wherein electronically transmitting the content to the designated device comprises electronically transmitting the content to the received phone number or address (Langseth, delivering the resulting content to the received phone number or address, column 3, lines 40-47).

Regarding claim 7, Roccetti and Anderson disclose the method according to claim 1, but are silent about receiving and displaying the list on the browser of the web-enabled device. However, Langseth further discloses the device comprises a browser, further comprising receiving and displaying the list on the browser of the web-enabled device (column 9, lines 20-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Langseth into the system of Roccetti and Anderson at the time of the invention to receive and display the list on the browser of the web-enabled device. The motivation to incorporate the teaching of Langseth into Roccetti's and Anderson's system would be to take advantage of easy use of the web browser for user interface.

Regarding claim 8, Roccetti and Anderson disclose the method according to claim 1, but are silent about faxing in his system. However, Langseth further discloses

electronically transmitting comprises faxing (column 9, lines 20-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Langseth into the system of Rocchetti and Anderson at the time of the invention to include faxing. The motivation to incorporate the teaching of Langseth into Rocchetti's and Anderson's system would be to enable Rocchetti's system to deliver the content in yet another way to the user.

Regarding claim 11, Rocchetti and Anderson disclose the method according to claim 1, but are silent about wherein electronically transmitting comprises sending the selected accessible content to a fax service provider, the fax service provider electronically sending the selected accessible content to the one or more designated device. However, Langseth discloses wherein electronically transmitting comprises sending the selected accessible content to a fax service provider, the fax service provider electronically sending the selected accessible content to the one or more designated device (column 9, lines 20-25). The motivation to incorporate the teaching of Langseth into Rocchetti's and Anderson's system would be to enable delivering the selected accessible content in yet another way to the user.

5. Claims 9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rocchetti and Anderson, and further in view of Y. Chen et al. ("iMobile EE: an enterprise mobile service platform", July 2003, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Volume 9 , Issue 4), hereinafter referred to as Y. Chen.

Regarding claim 9, Rocchetti and Anderson disclose the method according to claim 1, but are silent about electronically transmitting comprises instant messaging.

Art Unit: 2157

However, Y. Chen discloses Instant Messaging gateway for transmitting messages (page 286, column 2, paragraph 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Y. Chen into the system of Roccetti and Anderson at the time of the invention to electronically transmit the content via instant messaging. The motivation to incorporate the teaching of Y. Chen into Roccetti's and Anderson's system would be to enable delivering the selected accessible content in yet another popular way to the user.

Regarding Claim 12, Roccetti and Anderson disclose the method according to claim 1, but are silent about publicly accessible devices. However, Y. Chen discloses the public internet (e.g., from an internet café) and public workstations (page 290, column 2, paragraph 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Y. Chen into the system of Roccetti and Anderson at the time of the invention to further comprise providing the device so that it is publicly accessible. The motivation to incorporate the teaching of Y. Chen into Roccetti's and Anderson's system would be to enable Roccetti's and Anderson's system to be accessible to more people.

6. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti and Anderson, in view of Applicant's admitted prior art. Roccetti and Anderson disclose the method according to claim 1, but are silent about wherein electronically transmitting comprises fax over IP. However, fax over IP is well known in the art as admitted by the applicant (paragraph 0003). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art to use fax over IP to do electronically transmitting contents. The motivation would be that fax over IP is cheaper than traditional faxing.

7. Claims 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti, in view of Anderson and K. Chen.

Regarding claim 13, Roccetti disclose a method for initiating the electronic distribution of content over a communications network, comprising:

- generating a list of accessible content available at the server, the content having been provided by a first party associated with a device (Roccetti, "top-10 service", page 1069, column 1, paragraph 1);

- providing the list to the device ("top-10 service", page 1069, paragraph 1);

- receiving, at the device, a selection of accessible content from the list (Roccetti, "top-10 service", page 1069, paragraph 1);

- transmitting the selection to the server (Roccetti, download session, page 1068, column 2, paragraph 2); and

- retrieving the selected accessible content from storage associated with the server (Roccetti, download session, page 1068, column 2, paragraph 2).

Roccetti is silent about sending address/location information associated to a designated device to the server from the device, the designated device being different from the device; and sending the selected accessible content to the designated device using the address/location information. However, Anderson teaches a method of:

sending address/location information associated to a designated device to the server from the device, the designated device being different from the device (Anderson, the request email message, paragraph 0040); and sending the selected accessible content to the designated device using the address/location information (Anderson, print the document on the printer, paragraph 0040)

Note that Anderson's printer or destination address is different from the mobile device (web-enabled device). Thus, it is respectfully submitted that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Anderson into the method of Roccetti at the time of the invention to send address/location information associated to a designated device to the server from the device, the designated device being different from the device; and send the selected accessible content to the designated device using the address/location information. The motivation would be providing an efficient method for remotely managing and/or accessing content stored on a network device via another network device.

Roccetti and Anderson substantially disclose the invention as claimed. However, Roccetti and Anderson are silent about login information and authentication. However, K. Chen discloses a method of:

providing login information to a device (page 12, paragraph 0092);
transmitting the login information to a server (page 12, paragraph 0092);

authenticating the login information at the server (page 12, paragraph 0091);

Roccetti does mention that security issues have not been addressed and will be their future research topic (page 1073, paragraph 3). Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of K. Chen into the method of Roccetti and Anderson at the time of the invention to provide a method for initiating the electronic distribution of content over a communications network as described above. The motivation is to enhance the security of Roccetti's and Anderson's method.

Regarding claim 14, Roccetti, Anderson and K. Chen disclose the method according to claim 13, Roccetti discloses further comprising receiving a request for content distribution from the device, prior to generating the list (download session, page 1068, column 2, paragraph 2).

8. Claims 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti, Anderson and K. Chen as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Langseth.

Regarding claim 15, Roccetti, Anderson and K. Chen do not disclose the use of a phone number, fax number, or address for the designated device for transmitting the content. However, Langseth discloses a method that allows the subscriber to specify the output to be delivered to at least one of an electronic mailbox, facsimile, mobile phone, telephone, PDA, WAP device, and pager (claim 13). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Langseth into the system of Roccetti, Anderson and K. Chen at the time of the invention to receive a phone number, fax number, or address for the designated device, prior to electronically transmitting the content, and electronically transmitting the content to the designated device comprises electronically transmitting the content to the received phone number or address. The motivation would be to enable Roccetti's, Anderson's and K. Chen's system to transmit the content to specified destination/device.

Regarding claim 16, Roccetti, Anderson and K. Chen don't disclose receiving and displaying the list on the browser of the device. However, Langseth further discloses the device comprises a browser, further comprising receiving and displaying the list on the browser of the device (column 9, lines 20-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Langseth into the system of Roccetti and K. Chen at the time of the invention to receive and display the list on the browser of the device. The motivation to incorporate the teaching of Langseth into Roccetti's, Anderson's and K. Chen's system would be to take advantage of easy use of the web browser for user interface.

9. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti, Anderson and K. Chen as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Y. Chen.

Regarding Claim 17, Roccetti, Anderson and K. Chen don't disclose publicly accessible devices. However, Y. Chen discloses the public internet (e.g., from an internet café) and public workstations (page 290, column 2, paragraph 4). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Y. Chen into the system of Roccetti, Anderson and K. Chen at the time of the invention to further comprise providing the device so that it is publicly accessible. The motivation to incorporate the teaching of Langseth into Roccetti's, Anderson's and K. Chen's system would be to enable Roccetti's, Anderson's and K. Chen's system to be accessible to more people.

10. Claims 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti and Anderson, and further in view of K. Chen.

Regarding claim 20, Roccetti and Anderson disclose the system according to claim 18, but are silent about an authentication system for authenticating the web-enabled device. However, K. Chen discloses a system of authenticating the device (page 12, paragraph 0091). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of K. Chen into the system of Roccetti and Anderson at the time of the invention to address authentication issues in order to enhance the security of Roccetti's and Anderson's system.

Regarding claim 21, Roccetti and Anderson disclose the system according to claim 18, but are silent about wherein the web-enabled device is adapted to receive login information and provide the login information to the server for authentication. However, K. Chen discloses a system of receiving login information at the device, and transmitting the login information to the server, wherein authenticating the device comprises authenticating the login information (page 12, paragraphs 0092 and 0093). Roccetti does mention that security issues have not been addressed and will be their

Art Unit: 2157

future research topic (page 1073, paragraph 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of K. Chen into the system of Roccetti and Anderson at the time of the invention to provide a way of authentication using the login information in order to enhance the security of Roccetti's and Anderson's system.

11. Claims 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti and Anderson, and further in view of Langseth.

Regarding claim 23, Roccetti and Anderson are silent about wherein the web-enabled device includes a browser that displays the listing. However, Langseth further discloses the web-enabled device includes a browser, further comprising receiving and displaying the list on the browser of the device (column 9, lines 20-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Langseth into the system of Roccetti and Anderson at the time of the invention to receive and display the list on the browser of the device. The motivation to incorporate the teaching of Langseth into Roccetti's and Anderson's system would be to take advantage of easy use of the web browser for user interface.

Regarding claim 24, Roccetti and Anderson are silent about wherein electronically transmitting comprises sending the retrieved content to a fax service provider, the fax service provider electronically sending the retrieved content to the designated device. However, Langseth discloses electronically transmitting comprises faxing (column 9, lines 20-25). Langseth inherently discloses wherein electronically transmitting comprises sending the retrieved content to a fax service provider, the fax

Art Unit: 2157

service provider electronically sending the retrieved content to the designated device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Langseth into the system of Roccetti and Anderson at the time of the invention for sending the retrieved content to a fax service provider, the fax service provider electronically sending the retrieved content to the designated device. The motivation to incorporate the teaching of Langseth into Roccetti's and Anderson's system would be to enable Roccetti's and Anderson's system to deliver the content in yet another way to the user.

12. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roccetti and Anderson, and further in view of Y. Chen.

Regarding Claim 25, Roccetti and Anderson are silent about publicly accessible devices. However, Y. Chen discloses the public internet (e.g., from an internet café) and public workstations (page 290, column 2, paragraph 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Y. Chen into the system of Roccetti and Anderson at the time of the invention to further comprise providing the device so that it is publicly accessible. The motivation would be to enable Roccetti's and Anderson's system to be accessible to more people.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2157

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Oikawa (US 6,397,060 B1) discloses an information updating mechanism between a mobile terminal and a radio communication apparatus.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael C. Lai whose telephone number is (571) 270-3236. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2157

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Michael C. Lai
16NOV2007


YVES DALENCOURT
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100